

**Minutes of the Special Joint Meeting of the
Planning Board and Transportation Commission
Monday, August 25, 2008**

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. **Draft Transportation Element General Plan Amendment and Draft Environmental Impact Report.** A public hearing to take public comment on a Draft Environmental Impact Report and draft amendments to the City of Alameda General Plan. No final action or decision will be made at this meeting by either body.

Mr. Thomas summarized the staff report. He noted that with respect to the General Plan Amendment, the Planning Board would be the lead board, making a recommendation to the City Council. He added that because the General Plan Amendment addressed the Transportation Element, recommendations from the Transportation Commission will be brought forward as well. He noted that those recommendations would not be sought at this meeting. He advised that this meeting was intended to be a public hearing to introduce the Transportation Element to the public, to allow the public to make comments on the Element, and for the Board members and Commissioners to ask questions of staff. He added that the public hearing on the EIR would also be held. Comments would continue to be accepted until September 22, 2008. Staff would begin the production of the Final EIR on September 23, 2008, including all of the oral and written comments and concerns, and a comprehensive set of responses would be created. He estimated that the Final EIR would be available approximately one month after the close of the comment period, or the end of October, 2008.

Mr. Thomas noted that at this time, staff would record comments on the adequacy of the EIR, and the appropriateness of the Draft Transportation Element. The Planning Board would be asked to make a recommendation to the City Council whether the Transportation Element should be adopted as-is, or with changes. He noted that the Transportation Commission played a critical role in producing this draft Element.

Mr. Obaid Khan, Public Works, summarized the staff report and displayed a PowerPoint presentation describing the Draft Transportation Element in detail. He described the Draft Transportation Element contained a new street function classification system. He noted that the DEIR has the multimodal circulation plan goals, and that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies were included in the EIR.

Mr. Khan noted that the Transportation Element was based on four specific goals:

1. Circulation Goal, which focused on a system-wide application of the multimodal system in the City, and how it could be implemented, maintained and constructed. It addressed access issues related to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as well as how the emergency response network

should be maintained. It asked staff to maintain an adequate level of service for the transportation system. It mentioned how the TSM and TDM policies should be implemented, and the integration of that system should be integrated with the rest of the transportation system. It discussed alternate modes such as bicycles, pedestrians and transit, and how they should be accommodated in the Transportation Element.

2. Livability Goal, which discussed creating a balance between mobility and the quality of life in the City. The transportation system should complement and coordinate with the surrounding land uses. Air quality and water quality issues were discussed as well.
3. Transportation Choice Goal, which addressed the division of the system into different modes of transportation, and how it should function. The focus should be more on high occupancy vehicles, and moving away from single occupant vehicle usage. It discussed the means by which the pedestrian networks should be maintained, as well as how the TDM systems should be implemented.
4. Implementation Goal, which addressed how the defined infrastructure and systems would be paid for.

Mr. Khan described the street functional classification system in detail, and detailed its background within the City. He noted that five land use categories had been identified for the purposes of the Transportation Element:

1. Residential;
2. Commercial/Main;
3. General Commercial/Industrial;
4. School and Recreational Zones; and
5. Gateways to the City.

He described the modal overlays related to bicycle, transit and truck route priorities. He noted that the City Council accepted the Transportation Element on October 17, 2006, and directed staff to do the EIR analysis on the policies included in the Element. The Draft Transportation Element was brought before the Boards and Commissions in Spring 2007, and staff then initiated the Transportation Modeling effort. He noted that turning movement counts were collected for every signalized intersection in the City for a.m. and p.m. peak hours. He noted that the Transportation Element should be finalized by the end of the year.

President Kohlstrand suggested that the public hearing be opened, and noted that five speaker slips had been received. She suggested that the speakers' time not be limited in this matter.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Bill Smith noted that land use and transportation issues were closely connected. He wished to address the capacity on the Gateway tunnels, streets and bridges. As a bicycle commuter, he supported additional bicycle capacity along Fruitvale Bridge. He liked the

approach regarding the modal priorities in distancing themselves from the federal government, which he believed was auto-centered. He believed that bicycle lanes worked well as a traffic calming measure because they narrowed the street available to cars; they also made room for bicycles. He was encouraged by the direction taken by the Draft Transportation Element.

Ms. Susan Decker, Alameda Transit Advocates, believed the analysis of the impact considering alternative modes like bicycles, pedestrians and transit were very important. She noted that she rode the bus frequently, and did not believe that congestion was good for public transit or autos. She noted that some mitigations that were good for public transit, such as widening roads, were not good for pedestrians and bicyclists to gain access to the buses. She hoped the City would take the balance between modes of transportation into account. She inquired about the effect the current parking requirements might have on the amount of traffic generated by a project, as well as other environmental impacts. She inquired about the effect that decisions like street classifications and possible interruptions of the existing grid might have on people's access to public transit.

Mr. Richard Bangert noted that he had read Transportation Commission Chair John Knox-White's comments in the newspaper. He wished to discuss some unintended consequences on traffic flow near his home, near Calhoun and Broadway close to Otis. He noted that changed the traffic flow on Broadway between Otis and Encinal, and that there was no strong language in the new Transportation Element that could lead to it being corrected. He believed that most of the focus was on addressing problems that might arise with a new development, and that the unintended consequences should be corrected. He noted that until five years ago, the two westbound lanes of Otis at Broadway had no markings on them, and that they tapered into a single lane after crossing Broadway. He noted that there was a dedicated right-turn-only lane added, and prior to that, the traffic volume on Broadway was such that there was a break in the traffic in the morning commute traffic. With no dedicated right-turn lane, some people turned, and some did not turn. When there was a red light, there would be a break; drivers on Broadway or pedestrians had been able to cross; the color of the signal light had virtually no effect on the traffic flow. He noted that he had submitted written comments to Mr. Thomas. He noted that signal priority should be given to pedestrians, but that was complicated in instances where there were no signals. He believed that language stating that a signal or stop sign should be installed in intersections where safety must be increased. He believed the expectations of drivers on Broadway should be uniform. He was concerned about the school-age children in the area.

Mr. Eric Scheuerman believed that Alameda's current major and minor street classifications were uncomplicated, and that the new Transportation Element was essentially redevelopment of Alameda's street system. He believed that many residents did not want redevelopment, but wished to see a policy of refinement instead. He cited the recent reworking of Webster and Park Streets as a good example of refinement. He would like to see a study on the potential of excessive street striping, and how it affects neighborhoods. He believed the overall goal of livability may be achieved with minimal

striping. He believed that there were examples of both good and bad striping in Alameda, and added that more double yellow lines were being added to Alameda, creating a more congested, crowded and stressful environment. He believed the new Transportation Element would be a major change for Alameda, and urged the City to see the excellence of Alameda's existing hardscape street design, as well as the downsides. He urged the City to consider a policy of refinement.

Mr. Bert Libby noted that he was pleased to see the EIR statements and the livability goals in the TMP. He believed there was too little attention given to quality of life impacts and increased traffic in development issues. Mayor Johnson had stated that the TMP would accommodate future growth, maintain Alameda's unique character, and protect the current quality of life. He believed the TMP was missing two important sections, and that it was geared towards Alameda residents and their vehicle usage, but did not address non-Alameda traffic originating from off-island. He addressed the State and federal emission goals, and noted that Mayor Johnson had signed the U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement. He believed strongly that mitigations for future development should be solely directed at reducing traffic in order to reduce the negative environmental effects of development, rather than in trying to accommodate them. He believed the City should avoid creating problems in the first place. He noted that SB 375, which implemented AB 32, promoting smart growth development and required that new developments be located near transit corridors and centers in order to reduce vehicle miles traveled and emissions.

Ms. Ani Dimusheva expressed concern about the street classification system. She believed that Alameda had a very residential character, and was concerned that the street classification system defined some streets as more residential than others. She suggested a trial period to determine whether the solutions cause any unintended consequences elsewhere. She would like to see more transit in town, and believed that Alameda should be recognized as an open and uniformly accessible community. She would like to see more solutions for bike safety, and believed that every street should be a bike street. She suggested implementing "bicycle preferred lanes" on streets like Park Streets, and would like to see less regimentation of transportation modes on streets.

Mr. Bill Smith noted that this was a car-centric society and added that he had been cut off by a car while bicycling to the meeting. He agreed with the addition of signs that stated Alameda was a bicycle-friendly city, and hoped that the laws would be enforced more strictly.

Ms. Corinne Lamden expressed concern about pedestrians trying to cross two-lane roads safely, particularly when the drivers did not look for pedestrians carefully.

The public hearing was closed for Board and Commission discussion.

President Kohlstrand suggested taking comments on the plan first, followed by the environmental document.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that he had no comment at this time.

Board member Autorino noted that he had no comment at this time.

Board member Lynch believed there were a number of overlaps because one document was technical in nature, while the other was more qualitative in nature. He did not have any arguments with the technical document, and that he appreciated the distinction. He suggested a discussion addressing the present street uses versus traditional past uses of streets, and to share that information with the public. He believed there would be a heightened sense of comfort, and did not believe the methodology of the EIR could be argued. He believed the EIR was very sound and thorough, and appreciated staff's work in that regard. He noted that the plan itself was very comprehensive.

President Kohlstrand noted that the Transportation Commissioners' intent was trying to draft these documents so they would be more in sync regarding the movement of vehicles, as well as recognizing the need for buses circulating in the City and the need for every street to be pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly.

Board member Lynch noted that on his street, parking was allowed right up to the intersection. He noted that children walked across the street from Lydecker Park are not visible because of that parking arrangement, and that it was a quality of life issue. He inquired whether such issues should be included in the plan.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft commended the authors of this report, as well as the public for their comments. She noted that Alameda was growing like every other Bay Area city, and that it cannot remain frozen in time, but she did not believe the small-town character and quality of life should have to be sacrificed. She noted that the roads did not belong to one particular transportation mode. She had some concerns about significant decreasing levels of service at some intersections. She noted that when an accident occurred in the Tube heading out of town, the traffic throughout Alameda backed up. She noted that on page 4 of the Transportation Element Update, Objective 4.1.4 addressed proactive citizen involvement, particularly maintaining a public forum such as the Transportation Commission to facilitate public involvement. She suggested creating a citizen input website so they would not have to wait for the next public meeting or bad accident. She noted that the City of Oakland had such a website. She noted that more off-street bicycle parking was needed, and add parking lots should be striped to allow that.

Commissioner Krueger expressed concern with page 2.0-3 of the EIR summary, regarding Impact 4.2.1, which discussed traffic delay and the level of service. It stated that there was no feasible mitigation available, thus the resulting level of significance was significant and unavoidable. He was very surprised by that statement, and that the Transportation Commission discussed using transportation systems management and transportation demand management to reduce the number of trips generated and mitigated in that way. He was surprised that was not considered as a mitigation, and would like that to be addressed in the EIR. Similarly, page 2.0-4, for Impact 4.2.5, the claim was that it was significant and unavoidable because there was no mitigation available for the intersection impacts in a

cumulative sense. He did not see why TSM/TDM strategies were not considered, which he could understand if it concluded the mitigation was not sufficient; however, it seemed to him that it was not considered at all. He noted that pages 4.2-20 through 4.2-22 indicated TSM/TDM mitigation measures were mentioned, but the conclusion was that the impact would be significant and unavoidable. He did not see how it could be known in advance that the mitigation would fail, and that it could be potentially significant. He inquired what would happen if the traffic on Park Street were given priority, which would preserve the level of service for traffic on Park Street and using the Park Street Bridge, which he believed was the primary objective. He believed that at peak times, there would be a backup on Clement, and people would take alternate routes. He believed that would preserve the Island access, and noted that people may need to take alternate routes several times during the day. He noted that when the intersection was not over capacity, there would still be benefits of the Clement Extension. He believed that some of the analysis was somewhat simplistic in examining the LOS for the entire intersection, rather than prioritizing one direction over another.

Commissioner Krueger noted that with respect to the intersections discussed on pages 4.2-27-4.2-30, most of the proposed mitigations discussed adjusting signal timing or changing signal actuation, in conjunction with adding lanes. He would like to see the analysis of what could be achieved with the signal timing by itself. He noted there was considerable public concern about the effect of widening roads on pedestrians, bicyclists and transit. He noted that 4.2-28 through 4.2-29 used Tilden/Blanding/Fernside as an example; the text pointed out that the project alternative had reduced delay in at the intersection, yet the conclusion was that it was significant. He noted that also happened at the intersection of High and Fernside on page 4.2-29, and for High Street and Otis on page 4.2-29-4.2-30. He would like to see further explanation of that, so the effects of implementing the TMP to the baseline.

President Kohlstrand noted that she had the same questions, and added Island Drive and Doolittle, Park Street and Blanding, and Broadway and Tilden and Eagle. She noted that it was not clear what was analyzed, and that if the delays were less, why it was a significant impact.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff would examine those questions, as well as what could be done short of widening roads, and what it would take through TDM. He explained the meaning of the levels of service, and detailed the rationales within the documents. In response to an inquiry by Board member Lynch, he noted that staff endeavored to be as conservative as possible in creating EIRs.

President Kohlstrand believed confusion had been created over what was being analyzed, and that it changed the picture from dealing with traffic and travel in Alameda that was not solely focused on the auto, and that the project should be given its due credit.

Mr. Thomas noted that the air quality/vehicle miles traveled sections were written very conservatively, and that the new Transportation Element was given very little credit for mode shift. He noted that the amount of credit to be given for TSM/TDM should be determined. He noted that there were many policies encouraging transit and bicycle use.

With respect to optimizing the values, Mr. Khan noted that they were optimized, and that in the future, the signal timing would be automatically optimized. He noted that the signage for bike parking would be installed within the next few weeks. He noted that there would be at least 10 racks.

Commissioner Krueger noted that it was important to get a quantitative number out, as well as to obtain a qualitative look as well. He would like the TDM to be taken into account.

Board member Cunningham noted that one of the fundamental issues addressing the need was based on the supply or demand for transportation within the community. Under the assumptions in the EIR, there was an assumed growth of jobs in the community from 31,000 to 49,000, which represented a 65% increase in jobs on the Island, relative to an increase in housing from 31,000 to 36,000, a 17% increase. He noted that it would be important to identify where the supply and demand would be. He anticipated that there more growth in the Alameda Point area. He believed that mitigation should address getting people from areas where the housing was concentrated to where the jobs are. He would like to see other plans within the Transportation Element such as water taxis that would mitigate people not using roads; he suggested that a water taxi from Harbor Bay to Alameda Point may be workable.

Mr. Thomas noted that the numbers in the report relied primarily on ABAG and the regional forecasts to produce the jobs projections. Staff looked at those figures in the context of what kind of land was available for jobs; Alameda Point was the major area, and Harbor Bay Business Park was the other major job source.

Board member Cunningham noted that he had raised the definition of LOS in the Town Centre matters, and would like to add further clarification. He noted that a delay over 60 seconds at Santa Clara would be a LOS-F, and intersections such as Constitution and Atlantic at 53 seconds would qualify for LOS-E.

Mr. Khan advised that the year 2000 Highway Capacity Manual defined the level of service, and noted that it was based on delay. He noted that LOS-F was 80 seconds of delay.

Mr. Thomas explained the multimodal thresholds of significance, and added that staff needed to identify what would be considered a significant impact. He noted that past EIRs had been very automobile-oriented.

Board member Cunningham believed that study should be done before adoption of the plan. He inquired whether alternate LOSs would be considered based on the classification of the route. Mr. Thomas replied that would be a possibility, and noted that in Oakland, they had changed the designation of what was significant. He noted that they wanted to use the current established thresholds to evaluate that change. He noted that some intersections may go from D to E in the future using today's thresholds, which may be considered a significant impact. He noted that this was the time to disclose that if a

threshold were to be adopted, there will be intersections that go from D to E, and nothing would be done about it. He noted that it would depend on the community's wishes about what would be adopted.

Board member Cunningham inquired whether a safety factor was linked into the LOS, and noted that most of what they had seen was based on timing.

President Kohlstrand noted that it was based on average seconds of delay.

Mr. Khan noted that it was based on average delay per vehicle, and calculated each approach and averaged it. It discussed safety issues when congestion increased, and discusses more qualitative issues such as congestion impacting queues, or diversion to local and residential streets.

Commissioner Krueger wished to clarify that he did not want to use two different definitions of LOS, and that they should stick to the standard definitions. He added that the City should determine what they were willing to accept on certain circumstances, given the standards. He inquired whether it would be possible to analyze the levels of service of two different legs of an intersection, or whether CEQA required treating the whole intersection as one.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff could provide information about each leg of the intersection.

President Kohlstrand added that information was included in the tables in the background information

Commissioner McFarland had no comment.

Commissioner Lee had no comment.

Board member Moehring thanked the public for their comments, and would like to concentrate on the safety issues. She noted that safety in crossing intersections was a major issue, and recommended that drivers use both hand and directional signals when transiting those intersections. She appreciated the comment on the ability to correct things that did not work as well as anticipated. She agreed with the concept of starting simply and moving forward in smaller steps from there. She would like to see a little more traffic on Webster Street to patronize the businesses, and did not want the alternate routes to be so fast that they completely avoid Webster Street. She would like Webster Street to be welcoming.

Chair Knox White noted that he did not have a comment on the plan itself, and that while page 4.2-2 of the EIR discussed a light rail corridor, the TMP did not mention a light rail corridor. The TMP did mention an exclusive transit street. He believed that Board member Ezzy Ashcraft's comment about bike parking could be highlighted, and noted that the design factor of the retail streets should receive more focus. He noted that there was more to this plan than what was before the Planning Board and Transportation

Commission, and that the Pedestrian Plan had been approved by the Planning Board. He complimented Mr. Bergman on the effectiveness of public transit surveys. He agreed with Board member Moehring regarding the street classification, and added that a random survey to up to 2,000 homes had been mailed out through the AP&T bills. As a result of that survey, people believed that all streets should be used fairly equitably, but there should also be streets that would take people across the Island. He noted that the City tried its best to balance those needs. He noted that the EIR mentioned that there would be less than significant impact on air quality (4.3-8).

Chair Knox White noted that with respect to levels of service at intersections, he would like to take the long view and be sure that pedestrian and bicycle levels of service were addressed. With respect to the EIR, he noted that it was odd that there were two or three intersections that were found to be significant and unavoidable in the document that had already been declared significant and unavoidable for the traffic generated. He noted that the Alameda Landing EIR stated the traffic was significant and unavoidable, and he believed that every following project was identified as the source of the traffic being significant and unavoidable. He believed that it should be stipulated that it was significant and unavoidable, and that it may not make it worse, or may make it better.

Chair Knox White expressed frustration that proposed mitigations were identified, but that the effects of those mitigations were not examined, positive or negative.

Chair Knox White added that the City Council has already accepted the idea of reducing trips instead of accommodating them, but that the EIR did not address that option at all. He believed that while flexibility was good, cities should be able to identify their priorities such as reducing traffic. He noted that Mariner Square Drive was listed as a four-lanestreet, even though it was supposed to be reduced when it came to the Transportation Commission. He cautioned against the unintended consequences of mitigation. He expressed concern about the residents of Fernside getting out of their driveways because the platoons of cars being released from traffic lights travel down the street at even intervals that never break. He suggested that the City become more aware of those consequences. He would like the FEIR to discuss the length of the LOS D at intersections.

Chair Knox White noted that Eighth Street has more traffic under the Project than under the No Project use of Eighth Street, even though the project was meant to decrease its use. Under the Environmentally Superior Alternative, he suggested removing EIR policies 1, 2 and 6. He would like further clarification of the purpose of 500 pages of turn diagrams, which he believed was offputting to the average citizen. He added that there was a lot of technical data that would have been useful to have, that was not included in the document.

Chair Knox White echoed Board member Cunningham's comment regarding the price of gas, and believed the City was moving in the right direction regarding a mode shift; he added that the City would have the appropriate infrastructure and the accompanying planning process in place for the time when that shift occurs.

Commissioner Krueger requested that the technical appendices be separated into another document and printed separately. He emphasized that it should be available, but believed that it would be more convenient and less intimidating for the residents.

President Kohlstrand believed that the direction of the Transportation Element was very positive, and that it tried to reflect the values of the residents of Alameda. She did not believe Alameda wanted to have seven-lane intersections such as those found in Pleasanton or Livermore, and did not believe they enhanced the pedestrian atmosphere of those cities. She believed that everyone was a potential pedestrian, and that they should be respected. She believed the essence of the plan did not appear in the document, such as the goal of restricting the future amount of roadway capacity.

President Kohlstrand believed the thresholds of significance will be very critical, and that the City was in the awkward position of analyzing the Transportation Element using old significance criteria. She believed it was a goal worth pursuing, and that there was public support of changing the focus of transportation within the City. She believed the design standards for the streets and pedestrian improvements were also critical. She believed it was very important for the public to have an opportunity to provide input into that process. She believed it was important for the runoff and drainage to be improved, and for them to be more friendly to people who live and work in those areas.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she had supported green landscaping ordinances to accompany the green building ordinances. She noted that Ms. Eliason had stated that the time was not yet right for that, and that the positive aspect was that she would be able to work with Planning staff to incorporate these recommendations into a future green landscaping ordinance to meet legal requirements. She added that it was more economical as well.

President Kohlstrand emphasized that Planning and Public Works must work together on this issue, and that the standards should respect both safety issues and improving upon current standards. Regarding the environmental document, she was surprised to find that no intersections in the Alameda Point were listed as problematical.

Commissioner Krueger wished to discuss Section 6 with the No Project Alternative and the Environmentally Superior Alternatives, which were meant to distinguish them from the proposed TMP. He could not see any evidence that the phenomenon of induced traffic was taken into effect. He added that occurred when capacity was added in an attempt to mitigate congestion, an increase in traffic may also be caused because of new trips or shifted modes. He believed the impacts in 4.1.1, which stated that road widening can divide communities, and 4.2.2, Alternative Transportation, which documented negative outcomes of a mode shift, should be checked. He added that 4.1.2 should be checked as well, regarding land use and the increase of auto-oriented land use. He noted that 4.2.3 (page 6.0-10) should be checked with respect to safety, and that widening roads would allow for more free-flowing traffic, and that the speed limits may be compromised. He requested that 4.3.2 through 5 regarding air quality be checked, as well as 4.4.2 and 4.4.3,

regarding increasing noise impacts and induced traffic. He believed that some of the analysis was too simplistic, allowing people to believe that road widening was environmentally superior. He believed there was considerable evidence to suggest that was not the case.

President Kohlstrand noted that a one-page summary of proposed thresholds of significance prepared by Chair Knox White had been distributed. She recalled an experiment in New York City where several streets were closed to all traffic on a Saturday morning, and noted that would be tried in San Francisco by early September.

Chair Knox White discussed the summary, and explained the issue of multiple levels of service and their impacts on all modes of transportation. He noted that the solutions to the impacts must be prioritized, and added that the Transportation Commission will continue to have conversations about those issues.

Board member Lynch noted that one of the difficulties in land use planning was thinking in the abstract. He noted that issues such as the width of the sidewalks, whether there would be parking lanes, whether there would be one or two lanes of traffic, and what the width should be. He noted that commercial sectors also need loading docks and the capacity to bring in larger vehicles. He added that the intersection of these kinds of traffic must also coexist with pedestrians and bicycles. He noted that in order to develop thresholds of significance, it was helpful to have a context of the qualitative discussions. With respect to specific benchmarks, there must be a quantitative examination in order to create the findings. He added that the legal thresholds must be met to provide drawings, and he did not wish to see the issue become a slippery slope resulting in litigation.

President Kohlstrand believed this was a good start, and that the Transportation Commission would take it up in detail. She noted that many communities were struggling with the transition away from the traditional approach of looking at an intersection, and figure out what was happening with the automobile level of service. She noted that it was important to address what was happening as people moved around the city.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham whether any community had successfully looked at multimodal integration, Mr. Khan replied that Public Works had started examining that question and requested that Dowling Associates do research on that question. He had not seen a community that had multimodal thresholds of significance for different modes. He noted that the City of San Jose had gone through an EIR process in advance, and stated that the eight or nine intersections were considered to be protected and would not be touched. The intersections would be accepted at LOS F, but that the impacts would be disclosed. He noted that addressing one impact may trigger another impact for another mode.

Mr. Khan continued to state that other cities had taken a similar approach where certain intersections had been set aside, and that the impacts would be addressed in related locations. He noted that the consultants had stated that would take additional analysis and

the related costs. He noted that TSM/TDM plan would be on the horizon and would be undertaken once funding is found.

Commissioner Moehring noted that conceptually, she loved this plan, and that it was very clear. She believed there was a huge challenge ahead, and that it would take about a generation to extract people from their cars onto bicycles and other non-auto modes of transportation. She noted that it would be important to educate the next generations to do that, and believed it would be a difficult transition for many people.

Board member Lynch agreed with Commissioner Moehring's comments, and a group should be formed to examine those questions. He agreed that it would be very controversial, and commercial leases are in part dependent on the number of parking spaces.

Board member Autorino noted that he had a countervailing view, and discovered through his involvement on the Climate Task Force that people were ready to change. He believed there were some NIMBY issues with respect to retail and industrial uses. He believed that people were ready to get out of their cars, and believed it would happen more easily if the alternatives were made safer and easier. He was sure there would be discussions, and resistance by some people. He believed that living and parking were to be made convenient and attractive, and that people would accept the new concepts.

President Kohlstrand agreed with Board member Autorino's comments.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she saw more people on their bikes around town. She noted that Alameda was a safe town, and that people should be walking and using their bikes to help the environment, traffic and their health. She believed it was patriotic to do that, and hoped that schools would educate the children to motivate their parents.

In response to an inquiry by Chair Knox White regarding whether staff would revisit the numbers in the TMP versus the historical counts, Mr. Khan replied that his staff used a three-day count for Average Daily Traffic counts, versus one day used in other jurisdictions. (Tuesday through Thursday, with the three days averaged). Staff has used the CMA model, using ABAG and MTC values. He noted that in comparing number to number, staff was comfortable with the numbers for 2030, and that they used a peak-hour model. He noted that they had not seen a very good average daily traffic model that can project very well into the future for average daily traffic, and that most of the jurisdictions used peak-hour models for travel demand forecasting. Staff did not put them in the EIR because they were forecast, although the turning movement counts that were projected for this year and 2030 were included in the Appendix.

No action was taken.

-END OF ITEM-